

**REMARKS**

**INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-48 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claim 49-63 are added herein.

Therefore, claims 1-63 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-48 are rejected.

Claims 1-3 and 8-12 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.116**

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because:

(a) it is believed that the amendment of the claims puts this application into condition for allowance;

(b) the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicant believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;

(c) the amendments of the claims should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and

(d) the amendments do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

## REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-6, claims 1-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hsu in view of World Wide Web Consortium, *XML Schema Part I: Structures*, W3C Working Draft. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

## OVERVIEW OF HSU

Hsu discusses a system for assembling a product manual according to a document structure 218 and a configuration specification 216. An example of a configuration specification 216 is shown in Figure 4. The configuration specification 216 lists the component documents that are common to every instance of a product manual (see, 10, lines 12-20, and the documents listed at the bottom of Figure 4). Component documents are also retrieved from the document database "based on a machine-specific configuration" (col. 3, lines 19-24). See also Hsu's claim 1; "a product manual structure [constructed] from a model-specific configuration specification ... the product manual structure including document objects". The machine-specific specification also specifies documents of the product manual.

In Hsu, which documents are to be included in Hsu's manual is based on the configuration specification because the configuration specification is where documents of the product manual are added and updated (col. 2, lines 37-39; "[t]he configuration specification 216 includes a configuration section that specifies the documents", col. 10, lines 54-67). Finally, it is clear from Figure 2 that the product information 214, the configuration specification 216, and the generic document structure 218 are what determine the documents to be included in the product manual. The document database is only a storage facility.

The rejection primarily addresses the storage of documents rather than the determination of which stored documents to include in the hub document or product manual.

As discussed below with reference to the claims, Hsu is distinguishable based on details of the hub document preparation process (rather than the hub document itself), in particular automatically adding entity declarations (document references) to the hub document responsive to documents contained in a directory. Hsu differs at least because the presence of the documents in a storage directory does not control the composition of the hub document, and